HABS No. SC-686

William Enston Home
900 King St.
Charleston
Charleston County
South Carolina

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL INFORMATION

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20013

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

WILLIAM ENSTON HOME

HABS NO. SC-686

Location: 900 King Street (12.1 acres, east side of King, bordered by Huger Street to the south and the South Carolina Railway tracks to the east), Charleston, Charleston County, South Carolina. Most structures face southwest toward King Street.

Present Owner: The Board of Trustees of the William Enston Home.

Present Occupants: Thirty-four residents (traditionally referred to as "inmates" by the Board) -- three couples, seven single men, and twenty-one single women -- plus a resident superintendent (Paul Helton) and his family.

Present Use: Rent-free housing for the elderly poor.

Significance: The William Enston Home consists of twenty-nine structures on 12.1 landscaped acres. Buildings include the twenty-four residential cottages (HABS Nos. SC-686-A and SC-686-B), Memorial Hall (SC-686-C), Infirmary (Superintendent's House, SC-686-D), Water Tower (SC-686-E), Entrance Gate (SC-686-F), and Engine House (SC-686-G). All buildings (excepting the stone Entrance Gate) are of red brick, and all (excepting the Richardsonian Romanesque Gate and the bungalow-style Infirmary) feature a mixture of Romanesque and Queen Anne-style elements.

The William Enston Home is an early example of benevolent, philanthropic housing for the elderly. Funded by a bequest of 1859, the complex was built between 1884 and 1888, with additional structures put up in 1893, 1927, and 1933. With its neat rows of detached, double cottages set amid spacious, landscaped grounds, the Home provides an unusual and well-preserved example of nineteenth-century picturesque, suburban planning concepts adapted to this type of institutional function. On the local level, the Romanesque Revival is rare in Charleston, a cityscape dominated by its ante-bellum past, and the Enston Home provides one of the pre-eminent examples.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Housing the Elderly Poor in Nineteenth-Century America:

The population of the United States was rising dramatically by the mid-nineteenth century. One fast-growing category was that for Americans over the age of 50: in 1850 the U.S. Census recorded 2,068,332 Americans over age 50, or 8.9 percent of the population; by 1880 these numbers had jumped to 5,938,995, or 11.8 percent (*Abstract of the Fifteenth*

Census of the United States, 182). In his book *Growing Old in America*, David Hackett Fischer describes how while the relative number of elderly Americans increased, their social and economic status declined considerably. Put another way, as lifespan lengthened, length of employment decreased: "forced retirement had become common, but pensions remained rare" (160). By the century's end, the feeding and housing of these elderly indigents had become a cause for widespread concern, and during the first decade of the twentieth century, programs such as Massachusetts' first Public Commission on Aging and the first federal old-age pension bill (both 1909) began dealing with the problem on state-wide and national levels.

The William Enston Home in Charleston, South Carolina, is a living reminder of earlier, private efforts aimed at caring for these elderly poor. In his 1859 will, English-born businessman William Enston left the bulk of his large estate to his adopted city of Charleston. His stated purpose was to establish a benevolent home for the city's aged and infirm residents, a place designed, in his words, "to make old age comfortable." The only restrictions Enston imposed upon the home's future residents were that they be at least 45 years of age (unless suffering from "some great infirmity"), of "good, honest character . . . decent," and not insane. He went on to specify that the home should consist of "neat and convenient" two-story brick cottages, set on at least eight acres of ground, with private kitchens and gardens for the occupants' use. At the turn of the century one newspaper reported that at the Enston Home, unlike "the usual poorhouses or homes . . . men and women of refinement can lead almost exclusive lives, can receive their friends and entertain them simply, as in their own homes, and always amid refined and agreeable surroundings" (see clipping in file No. 30-01, "900 King Street," South Carolina Historical Society).

To understand the significance of the Enston Home, one must place it within the broader context of low-income and philanthropic housing as these were available in nineteenth-century America. At the time of Enston's death in 1860 there existed three options for those Americans who could not maintain their own homes, rely on their families, or afford to pay free-market rents. These were the so-called "seven percent philanthropy," private benevolent homes and societies, and the city or county almshouse.

"Five percent" or "seven percent" philanthropy refers to a practice begun by British social activists and philanthropists in the 1830s and 1840s. In essence, it involved persuading investors to finance low-income housing projects, from which they could expect to reap a modest profit -- a 5 to 7 percent net return being the minimum for which most investors were willing to become involved. (For more on this, see Birch and Gardner, Zaitzevsky, Curl, and Bremner [1958].) By the 1850s the "seven percent solution" had spread to America, where its best-known proponent, working in the 1880s, was Brooklyn's Alfred T. White. By the 1870s and 1880s American journals like the *Sanitary Engineer* were running articles and competitions related to model tenement design and seven percent philanthropy. Architecturally, this type of aid most often resulted in new or remodeled multi-story tenement or dormitory buildings. Located in densely populated urban areas, these projects were mainly directed at low-income workers and their families, and so they did not apply to the poorest of the poor, the category into which the unemployed elderly

most often fell. A related development was the company towns, like Oakgrove, Connecticut (1865), and Pullman, Illinois (1879-95), where skilled workers could rent cottages or row houses from their employers at relatively low rates; such arrangements were offered to satisfy worker desires for individual homes and to develop company loyalty.

Private benevolent homes, for the most part, were church-run affairs, limited to the elderly members of a particular religious faith or congregation. According to Amos Warner in his 1894 study *American Charities*, these places usually charged a fee for their services, "a sum down, which insures care during life." According to Warner, this was "really a life annuity for somewhat less than its money value. One hundred to six hundred dollars is the sum charged, and persons are usually not admitted under sixty years of age. Sometimes the age limit is still higher" (354-55). The populations housed by these institutions were often small, frequently fewer than twenty persons. In late nineteenth-century Charleston such homes included the Caroline Wilkinson Home "for ladies in connection with church of the Holy Communion," the Episcopalian House of Rest, and the St. Philip's Church Home. Other institutions serving comparably limited constituencies were veterans' homes and the geographically or ethnically restricted fraternal organizations, like Charleston's St. Andrew's Society (founded in 1730). Discussing these types of agencies, Warner noted that "the provision for aged dependents is . . . quite inadequate to the demand" (355).

The final and most pervasive of these three housing types were city- or county-run almshouses. Warner described the almshouse as "the fundamental institution in American poor-relief." He went on to say that "its inmates are often the most sodden driftwood from the social wreckage of the time" (195). These were the institutions whose populations had the most in common with that which concerned William Enston -- elderly, poor, and from a variety of ethnic and religious backgrounds.

The earliest almshouses were probably those built in Canterbury, England, by Bishop LeFranc. In the late eleventh century LeFranc founded the Hospital of St. John at Northgate (for the care of aged and infirm men and women), and the Hospital of St. Nicholaus at Harbledown (for lepers). Medieval almshouses generally borrowed their architectural forms from collegiate or monastic precedents -- that is, quadrangular buildings enclosing courtyards, with rows of private sleeping cells, a chapel, and a communal dining hall. William Enston was born and raised in Canterbury, and during his youth the town maintained no fewer that eight medieval almshouses. A later example, Jesus Hospital, dating from 1595, was founded in Canterbury by an ancestor of Enston's mother, Sir John Boys. The hospital was funded with still later endowments from other members of the Boys family.

The first American almshouses, like Philadelphia's Bettering House (known locally as the "Pauper's Palace"), date from the mid-eighteenth century. The Charleston Poor House, renamed the Almshouse and eventually the Charleston Home, dates from 1771. It was located at the corner of Mazyck (now Logan) and Magazine streets. (For further reference, see the Charleston *Yearbooks*, 1880, 42-4, and 1881, 140-42.)

During the Jacksonian era, after 1820, almshouses became a truly pervasive American institution. As the U.S. population swelled with European immigrants, many of them unskilled and impoverished, city and county governments increasingly turned to the almshouse as a solution for dealing with the problems of their poor citizenry. David Rothman, in *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, notes that between 1820 and 1840 sixty towns in Massachusetts built new almshouses, while several others remodeled existing ones. By 1840, that state alone contained 180 of these institutions (180, 183).

In *American Charities*, Warner identified three types or phases of almshouse design. The first almshouses were usually abandoned farm or factory buildings. While smaller communities continued to make do with these converted structures, larger towns and cities soon erected new buildings with the express purpose of housing the local poor. These purpose-built structures, like Boston's 1821 House of Industry, consisted of stark, orderly forms that were reflective of the operations and ideals the building housed. Warner called this type the "imposing edifice," and he quoted one contemporary author who described it as having been conceived "from the outside in . . . perfectly symmetrical . . . planned for the admiration of the passers-by rather than for the comfort of the inhabitants . . . generally four or five stories high, regardless of the infirmities of its inmates" (197).

The third type was what Warner called the "cottage farm." Dating from "the last quarter of the nineteenth century," this generally consisted of "a group of houses, sometimes connected by passages, permitting the complete separation of the sexes, separate hospital cottages, and a central administration building" (198). The *Sanitary Engineer*, beginning on December 20, 1883, ran a series of articles by Henry C. Burdett on "cottage hospitals." By this term Burdett was describing small single-building facilities, or groups of huts, tents, or pavilions, set on "tastefully planted" grounds. He reported that there were few such hospitals in America (the exception being in Massachusetts, where there were fifteen examples), and none in Canada. He claimed that the most successful such institution was one opened at Cranleigh, Surrey, England, in 1859. Burdett noted that the first American hospital of this type was probably the House of Mercy, opened in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, on January 1, 1875 (68). For his part, Warner cited the "New York City Farm Colony, established on Staten Island as a branch of the Home for the Aged and Infirm" (198).

The Enston Home is an outstanding example of this type of institution, though neither Warner nor Burdett mention it. Worth noting is the fact that while the Home's execution falls within Warner's "last quarter of the nineteenth century," William Enston's conception for a cottage hospital is much earlier, dating back at least to his 1859 will.

Most almshouses administered two types of aid: "indoor" and "outdoor." Outdoor assistance, conceived as partial or temporary aid, involved the provision of food (and sometimes fuel) rations to people who lived outside the confines of the almshouse. Although cheaper to provide than indoor relief, outdoor assistance was frowned upon by many because it was thought to rob the poor of initiative and encourage laziness. After about 1850 this type of aid became increasingly rare in the United States.

Inmates, as recipients of indoor assistance were called, received full-time food and shelter within the almshouse itself. Healthy inmates were expected to work, and all were required to follow strictly enforced codes of behavior. In many cases, inmates were "sold" or rented out by the almshouse to the highest bidder -- local farmers and factory owners. Punishments -- reduced rations, beatings, solitary confinement -- were meted out to those who shirked their assigned duties, or otherwise broke the house rules. The alternative was to be expelled from the building and the town, turned out to face homelessness and starvation, or turned over to the penitentiary.

Almshouse inmates were isolated from the other economic classes of their communities. In some cases they wore uniforms, like prison inmates. The connotations of the term "inmate," for residents of the almshouse, are obvious. As Rothman points out, "incarceration became basic to the system of support . . . all across the country institutionalization became as important to the care of the poor as it was to the treatment of the criminal and the insane" (184, 186). In the young, expansionist United States, the poor were thought by most to be responsible for their own poverty. The aim of the almshouse was to rehabilitate them through hard work and discipline, and only then, allow them to return to society.

According to Rothman, the reformatory aspects of institutionalizing the poor were in most cases outweighed by the punitive aspects. Make the almshouse unpleasant enough, the logic went, and the poor would be frightened into independence, forced to think twice about asking for public support (195). Historian Walter Fraser has noted that conditions in Charleston's almshouse (where solitary confinement and near-starvation diets were standard means of discipline) were such that "the needy poor refused to apply," preferring to go without rather than face the indignities of an institution whose reputation was that of "a place for the punishment of the unworthy" (193, 237).

Since poverty was regarded as a form of social deviancy, it is no surprise that the poor were often locked up and guarded along with convicted criminals and mental patients. Categorization and separation of these groups was more often a matter of administration than of practical reality. In many towns, the workhouse, the insane asylum, and the almshouse were fitted into the same physical structure.

The ideal almshouse was an orderly, regulated correctional institution. The reality, however, was often something otherwise. According to Warner, it was "ordinarily a depressing experience to visit an almshouse" (195). Overcrowding, dilapidation, dirt, and disease were the rule in almshouses all over the country. According to one 1833 report cited by Rothman, the Boston House of Industry packed 623 inmates into its single building -- "the aged, decrepit and insane . . . abandoned children and expectant, unwed mothers" all crowded together in the same rooms, averaging seven persons to a room" (196). An 1857 report on the conditions uncovered during an inspection tour of almshouses in New York state found that almost all were "badly constructed, ill arranged, ill warmed and ill ventilated." "As receptacles for adult paupers," the report continued, "the committee does not hesitate to record their deliberate opinion that the great mass of poor houses . . . are most disgraceful memorials of the public charity. Common domestic

animals are usually more humanely provided for than the paupers in some of these institutions" (198). The report provided numerous depressing case studies: in Oswego, New York, for example, seventy-five sick, lame, insane, young, and old indigents were found living in a nine-room facility; in Chatauqua, thirty-two inmates shared a single, unventilated room (198-99).

Despite its many shortcomings, the almshouse remained the most common mode of public relief on into the 1890s. Rothman reports that between the 1850s and the 1890s, indoor relief grew to be widely favored over outdoor aid: "Practically every participant in the national conference on charity and correction, as well economists and social critics, voiced their approval" of the almshouse system (205).

Charleston's Almshouse was relocated in 1856 to a renovated factory building on Columbus Street, between Drake and Court. Here, 200 inmates and 900 outdoor pensioners received support. Both of these numbers dropped considerably over the next few decades, due in part to the expanded presence of private charities like Enston's, and to massive cuts in the Almshouse operating budget. During his administration, Mayor William Ashmead Courtenay slashed that institution's annual budget by more than 60 percent, from almost $25,000 in 1870 to just $8,000 in 1880. A large percentage of the difference came from cutbacks in outdoor relief programs. By 1883, the *City Directory* reported that the almshouse, "affording comfortable accommodations for about 110 persons," supported eighty-seven inmates and 237 pensioners (32).

The 1880 *Yearbook* described the Charleston Almshouse as a "commodious brick building . . . a model of orderly arrangement and cleanliness" (42). In spite of this enthusiastic appraisal, the *Yearbook* went on to suggest that "a beneficial change would be to transfer the whole establishment to a healthy farm within the city limits" -- a statement which implies that the current home was somewhat less than healthy, and leaves one wondering just whom the move was intended to benefit most. A sort of sister institution, the Old Folks Home, for African-American indigents, was already operating on a then-remote, fifteen-acre site on the Ashley River, near the present-day Citadel campus. While there were indeed benefits for the inmates of these larger, more remote sites -- e.g., less crowding, space for gardens -- it is also true that, whatever the intentions underlying them, they also served to remove residents from the center of the city's affairs, out of sight and out of mind.

B. William Enston and His Bequest:

1. Biographical Outline:

In 1843, ten years after arriving in Charleston, William Enston wrote to a friend:

> You know, when a boy, I was always of an ardent, sanguine, nervous temperament, which caused me often to get into scrapes not exactly my own. In this case (moving to Charleston) I was, however, more fortunate. I soon identified myself with the people

> and entered into all their sympathies. From that time on my march was onward (*Proceedings on the Occasion of the Dedication of Memorial Hall*, 24).

Writing in his thirty-fifth year, Enston adopted here a tone one might expect of a much older man, one looking back over a long life. Yet sixteen years prior to founding the home that bears his name, he was already indicating his sense of civic devotion and personal destiny, his history of entering fights "not exactly his own."

William's father, Daniel Enston, worked as a cabinet-maker in Canterbury, England. In 1807 he married Sarah Knowles, a direct descendant of Sir John Boys, the founder of Canterbury's Jesus Hospital for "honest persons of good behavior." The document that founded this institution, reprinted in part in the 1889 *Proceedings*, went on to say that residents of Jesus Hospital "shall be fifty-five years of age at the least, and also lame, blind, or unable to get their living, and for seven years resident of Canterbury" (32). Whatever the actual significance of this heritage to Enston, Charlestonians in the 1880s believed it formative: the Canterbury hospital was thought to be the direct inspiration for William Enston's gift to Charleston. (This point will be taken up in greater detail in a later section of this report.)

The eldest of seven children, William Enston was born in Canterbury on May 5, 1808. In 1820 the family emigrated to the United States, to Philadelphia, where Daniel Enston established a shop not far from Independence Hall. Following his father's trade, William apprenticed as a furniture-maker, chair-painter, and gilder. In the evenings he took classes at Philadelphia's Franklin Institute. The *Proceedings* report that in 1889 a portion of his library -- books "of History and Science, and Literature and the Poets" -- was being preserved, though it does not say where or by whom, and it has not been possible to locate this collection (23).

Following his mother's death in 1832, William Enston moved south to Charleston. Along with business interests, health concerns are thought to have provided some of his motivation for the move. In Charleston, Enston's first job was on eight-month contract with "a French lady who had a furniture store in Meeting Street" (*Proceedings*, 23). Soon after, he opened his own small business on the same street. In 1834 he returned to Philadelphia to marry Hannah Shuttlewood, of Colsterworth, England. The couple returned to set up house on Charleston's Queen Street and to worship at St. Michael's Episcopal Church. About this time Enston moved his business to a small store on the comer of King and Clifford streets. As it prospered and expanded, he diversified his interests and began acquiring real estate both in and outside of Charleston. Among his many properties were a half interest in the Charleston Hotel, numerous lots and buildings in Charleston, Chicago, Cincinnati, and elsewhere, and part ownership in three steamships -- the *Northerner*, the *Southerner*, and the *Isabel*, running between Charleston, New York, and Havana. In 1848 he built a large, new building for his original business, now called the Phoenix Furniture Company. This building still

stands at the corner of King and Clifford (*Charleston News and Courier*, April 21, 1969, 1-B).

While few of Enston's own words survive, an 1846 letter to a friend, published as part of the 1889 *Proceedings*, provides some insight into his political and philosophical beliefs. As Enston wrote,

> I have always been a staunch democrat, and yet . . . the fact is, I can never become a party man. I never saw a party with all my principles. . . . this is a government of compromise and concession. The strong must protect the weaker, and the interests of this extended country are so different that nothing but concessions and compromises can keep us together. . . . I do not believe in war (*Proceedings*, 26-7).

Enston went on here to discuss the steamships he had just begun operating, and it becomes clear that his desire for compromise was at least partly driven by business and property interests (including, perhaps, the trade in slaves, in which he himself participated). But he also predicted, correctly, that Charleston would be devastated by war, and here he expressed a genuine affection for the place where his fortune had been made. His call for protection of "the weaker" by the strong is suggestive, and though it is not clear from the context just what he meant by this line, it is tempting to read it as an indication of his developing philanthropic leanings.

Enston died in Charleston of heart disease on March 23, 1860. He was 52 years old and childless. His obituary was published in the *Charleston News and Courier* on March 24. The contents of his will, until then a closely guarded secret, were revealed at that time. An entry for that same date in the diary of Charleston merchant Jacob Sass Schirmer reported that "the town is all alive on this subject. He (Enston) is thought to have left over a million and if the will is carried out, the City will get in after years the most of it, Provided the Lawyers dont have the first pickings" (*South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 1960, 163). A *News and Courier* story dated March 26 reported on the funeral, attended by the mayor, the city council, and a "concourse of citizens." The procession carried Enston's body to Charleston's railway station, where it was put aboard a train and sent back to Philadelphia. According to his wishes, he was buried beside his mother in that city's Laurel Hill Cemetery. On January 20, 1915, the trustees of the Enston Home donated $255 for repairs to Enston's grave site and the establishment of a perpetual maintenance fund.

2. Enston's Will:

Enston's will, written in his own hand, was dated July 19, 1859. After stipulating that his debts be paid, he named his various heirs and annuitants and recorded the sums that each was to receive. His wife, Hannah, named sole executrix of the will,

was to receive not less than $10,000 per annum for the remainder of her life. Finally, he concluded the will with the following passage:

> . . . at the death of all parties concerned, it is my wish and will that the whole fund shall go to the City of Charleston, for the following purposes and upon the following provisions: To build up a Hospital for Old and Infirm persons. None must be admitted under the age of forty-five (45) years, unless in case of some great infirmity; some lameness, some physical infirmity. I entirely exclude lunacy from the said Hospital; it is more for to make old age comfortable, than for anything else. The necessary qualifications for entrance must be poverty; a good, honest character; the parties must be decent, and the gift of the places must be invested in the hands of twelve Trustees, chosen by Council, and the said Trustees, together with the Mayor of the City, shall determine whether they are proper persons for the charity. There shall always remain in the gift of any of my family, if any be alive, six gifts for six individuals, before anything can be done with my funds. For such a purpose the City of Charleston must furnish not less than eight acres of ground, to erect the said cottages on, for each cottage must have a small garden to busy the occupant. These cottages must be built of brick, in rows, neat and convenient, two stories high, having each two rooms and a kitchen. As I have no time now, there must be made a plan of said Hospital, and submitted to my wife HANNAH, for her approval. The lot of ground or its location, must have her approval.

As already noted, the builders of the Enston Home believed that their benefactor had been inspired by the example of his ancestor, John Boys. In fact, Enston's will does compare on a number of points with the document that established Jesus Hospital in 1595. (For the full text of this document see *Papers Relating to Certain Charitable Foundations at Canterbury, England, the Originals Loaned by Alderman G.R. Frend, Mayor of Canterbury, for the Use of the Trustees of the William Enston Home*, 24-31.) Both institutions were directed at the elderly poor, while also making provision for lame or infirm persons who did not meet the age requirements. Both lay stress on the character of prospective inmates -- their "worthiness" to receive aid. (By the 1850s philanthropists on both sides of the Atlantic had begun distinguishing between the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor; Enston's exclusion of "lunatics" can be understood in this light -- motivated by a desire to separate the "worthy" poor, who often shared institutional space with mental patients.) Both bequests stipulated that garden space be provided for inmates' use, and finally, in both cases, a limited number of spaces was to be made available for distressed family members. At the Enston Home, this last provision has been utilized at least once.

Along with his ancestor's example, Enston may also have been aware of recent

developments in British and American philanthropic housing. Most such activity, however, was of the "seven percent" variety -- i.e., directed at housing workers. In the 1850s, Charleston's elderly poor turned to church-run homes, or to the city almshouse. Enston's intention seems to have been to provide an alternative to these: a comfortable, dignified, non-sectarian, city-run home for the "worthy," elderly poor. In this, his bequest was highly unusual to say the least. Considering its early date, it was quite possibly unique within the South, if not the nation.

Enston's will is also remarkable for its attention to particulars of administration and design. Enston demanded "neat and convenient" two-story cottages, built of substantial, long-lasting materials, surrounded by plenty of open, cultivated space. His mention of gardens and rows of dwellings does, in fact, call to mind earlier English almshouses -- the sort of structures he would have known from his youth in Canterbury. With their private kitchens and gardens, occupants of the Enston Home would be able to maintain a level of self-sufficiency, and a measure of space, unheard of in the crowded city almshouse. The home finally built in the late 1880s, though stylistically different from anything Enston would likely have imagined, adhered closely to the terms spelled out in his will.

3. William A. Courtenay, Hannah Enston, and the Settlement of the Will:

William Enston's estate amounted to something less than the "over a million" presumed in Schirmer's diary. An 1860 probate inventory valued the estate at $583,097.95, an amount which still placed Enston among Charleston's wealthiest citizens. The war diminished the estate considerably -- owing to losses from property damage and the cost of repairs, devalued stocks and bonds, and emancipated slaves -- but by 1881 it had rebounded to a level of $446,827.48.

Following her husband's death, Hannah Enston moved north to Emilie, Pennsylvania, to be near family, and during the next twenty years of war and reconstruction, little action was taken on her husband's will. The first real movement came in 1880.

In that year, progressive Democratic Mayor William Ashmead Courtenay initiated publication of the City of Charleston *Yearbook.* Published annually until the 1950s, the *Yearbooks* provide detailed records of the yearly finances, operations, and activities of all the city's various departments and agencies. An extract of Enston's will and a statement from Courtenay were printed in the *Yearbook* for 1880. According to Courtenay's statement, there were "no records in the Mayor's office . . . for the past twenty one years." He wrote that "I have informed myself generally on the subject, and find the estate is a very large one, and I hope to be able, in a few weeks, through a promised interview with the Executrix of the estate, to give fullest details of this munificent bequest" (59-60).

Courtenay and Hannah Enston wrote to one another on at least three occasions during the months of April and May 1881. Though Courtenay's opening inquiry of

April 4, 1881, no longer survives, Hannah's response to it is found today among a collection of papers in the Charleston Library Society. Titled "*To Make Old Age Comfortable": Original Letters and Papers Relating to the Settlement of the Wm. Enston Bequest to the City of Charleston, 1860, Effected with Mrs. Hannah Enston, Executrix, 1881-82*, these were gathered, bound, and presented by Courtenay to the Library Society in 1906. The volume begins with a photograph and original autograph of Queen Victoria -- an odd opening note intended, most likely, as an allusion to the Enstons' British birth, and to the overall English architectural and institutional character or the Enston Home. Hannah Enston's letter reads as follows:

April 18, 1881

My Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 4 inst. was duly received and since then I have given its contents my most earnest consideration and have concluded that the proposition made by you relative to a settlement during my lifetime of the residuary Estate of my late husband William Enston will meet with my approbations provided of course that all parties interested either as legates or annuitants shall be properly and satisfactorily provided for and due allowance made for the remainder of my life. I am prompted to this course by an earnest wish to see as far as possible the wishes of my late Husband carried out as contained in his will. So though if you will advise with the proper authorities of the City of Charleston and submit to me the plans and course which would to them seem to most meet I will give it prompt and careful consideration and have no doubt that such arrangements may be made so that all will be fully and perfectly satisfied. . . .

I need not remind you that my years are now but few and an early attention to this should be given if we hope to consumate (sic) it, as it will no doubt, owing to the diversity of interests to be considered, require a length of time. Possibly greater that would at first light seem.

I am yours, very Respectfully, Hannah Enston

On May 5, Enston invited the mayor to meet with her at the New York office of her attorney, Kennard Buxton. Whether Courtenay himself made this visit is not certain, but on June 17-20, 1881, Charleston attorney J. P. K. Bryan did meet in Brooklyn with Buxton, Enston, and her agent, Joel Sherwood. In a memo discussing these meetings Bryan wrote, "The counsel of Mrs. Enston [whom Bryan called "Kenneth" Buxton], although stating that Mrs. Enston's desire was to effect a settlement in her lifetime if possible, distinctly refused to make any propositions." Letters between Buxton and Bryan dated between June and December 1881

demonstrate an increasingly frosty and adversarial relationship. Bryan asked repeatedly for full financial disclosure, while Buxton consistently maintained that he had already revealed all available accounts. Bryan tended to inflate the value of the estate (frankly stating his refusal to believe that so much of the stock had become worthless since the war), while Buxton undervalued it (beginning with an estimate of $350,000 to $375,000).

On December 4, Buxton threatened to break off negotiations altogether. An exchange between Courtenay and Buxton (the mayor wrote on December 24; Buxton responded on January 7), though terse, at least addressed the fact that a misunderstanding existed, and in so doing, managed to put things back on track. Finally, on January 18, 1882, Bryan wrote Buxton to say that "the City (was) ready to settle."

A few days later, however, on February 8, Bryan was corresponding with Mrs. Enston's new counsel, Isaac Hayne, of the Charleston law firm Hayne and Ficken. Whether Enston retained Buxton's services after this date is not clear. In any event, no letters from him appear in Courtenay's records after January 18. Enston may have simply decided that her interests could be more expediently served by a Charleston firm. Another explanation may be that she considered Buxton's relationship with the city so precarious that she feared it might jeopardize the entire project.

Bryan's February 8 letter to Hayne proclaimed that "the Committee of the City Council of Charleston charged with the matter of the Enston Estate have considered and unanimously agreed to recommend and urge the adoption of, by the City Council of Charleston, the proposition submitted in writing by you last evening as authorized by Mrs. Enston." A "Scheme for a Settlement of the Estate" was attached to the letter. Contained in it were five main parts, the most pertinent portions of which were: that Enston would hand over to the city a sum of $200,000, to be placed in trust until the death of the last annuitant (which finally occurred in 1932), plus $75,000 in cash and securities, and all remaining real estate (valued at $61,950); that the city furnish for the Home site four acres immediately and four more within the next ten years; and that a twelve-member board of trustees (in accordance with the will) be established to oversee the Home. Enston retained $100,000 for her personal maintenance, an amount which several members of the city council thought excessive, but finally agreed to.

The settlement was to take effect March 16, 1882. It was confirmed by the city council of Charleston in an ordinance dated August 8, 1882. This specified that the trust be kept separate from other city funds, so that the money could not be diverted from William Enston's expressed intention for it. To this end it was agreed to turn the twelve-member board of trustees into an independent, self-perpetuating agency, and to hand the endowment over to them. On December 21, 1882, the trustees of the William Enston Home were incorporated by an act passed in the general assembly of the state of South Carolina. Consisting

of local business and professional people, this board has, in effect, owned and operated the Home as a quasi-public agency ever since, making annual reports to the mayor of Charleston (an ex-officio member of the board) and the city council.

C. The Site and Architecture of the Enston Home:

The development and formal characteristics of the site and buildings are discussed in detail in other portions of this overview, and in the individual building reports. Discussion here is limited to considerations of the Home's location, the concepts and sources underlying its development, and the place of this project within the context of nineteenth-century urban and suburban planning and cottage architecture.

As previously mentioned, leaders in many cities saw advantages to placing their almshouses outside of the urban center. While the inmates acquired more healthful and abundant living space this way, other citizens were spared daily contact with their poverty, and put at a safe distance from the epidemics which often raged through these places. The builders of the Enston Home may have considered these issues, but there were other, more significant reasons for the selection of the King Street site.

A Bird's Eye View of the City of Charleston, South Carolina, drawn and published by C. Drie in 1872, shows a dense concentration of buildings south of The Lines (present-day Line Street, some seven blocks south of Huger Street and the Enston Home site). North of this was open farm land, punctuated by small villas maintained as get-aways by wealthy Charlestonians. Considering the dense development of its southern end, the city could meet Enston's eight-acre-minimum demand only by choosing a site somewhere along its northern edge. An eight-acre tract, 2 miles north of the city's center, was purchased in August 1882. An article in the *Pine Forest Echo* dated July 15, 1892, reported that of the various sites considered, the one on King Street was Hannah Enston's favorite (104). She approved of it officially on July 24, 1882, in a letter to Courtenay.

The 1884 *Yearbook* included a discussion of the Home's sewage system, wherein it was suggested that this site -- while perhaps not the city's most desirable address -- was valuable from the standpoint of its potential influence on future urban growth. Moreover, once it was filled and graded, the site would provide a healthful refuge: "It is confidently believed that the avoidance of stagnant water in this large area, and its thorough drainage, will remove all objections to residing in these localities, and as the only growth of the city must be Northward, this work of sanitation will have its influence on the early spread of the city in this direction, as well as making healthy the Home land" (100-1). The *News and Courier* used similar terms, praising the Home site for providing an "impetus . . . to building in that locality," and concluding that "we may soon expect to find residences planted beyond the present outposts of the William Enston Home" (August 9, 1882).

The sewage system just mentioned -- discussed in a separate section of this overview (see part II, section D below) -- was an important and much-discussed feature of the Home's design. Not until the late 1890s, at the persistent urging of Dr. Henry Horlbeck, did the

city council agree to install a municipal sewage system in a small area around Broad Street (Fraser, 330-2). By contrast, a decade earlier the trustees of the Enston Home had brought in Rudolph Hering of Philadelphia, one of the country's leading sanitary engineers, to design their system. When completed, this system was the most modern and efficient in the city.

In other areas too, the Home was, when new, among the most advanced architectural developments in Charleston. In a two-page report of 1882, titled "Some Suggestions looking to the founding of the Model Village, to be known as the William Enston Home," Mayor Courtenay described the "extent of the proposed village," and the "work first to be done." Courtenay here was already considering the installation of electric lighting, with an on-site power plant if necessary, and centralized steam heating for the cottages -- then both new and fairly exotic technologies. Additionally, he called for the Home's streets to be paved with granite blocks. At that time, most of the city's fifty-odd miles of roads were still unpaved or, at best, covered with shells, wood planks, or bricks. Courtenay's report predicted that the Home's roads would "last forever, and always be in perfect order."

Of course, unlike the city council, the trustees of the Enston Home had a great deal of money and just one project to spend it on. More surprising than the financial expenditure, though, was the attention to quality and detail that these busy politicians and business people devoted a home for the poor. Still surviving are numerous letters between the trustees and various contractors, negotiating the goods and services to be provided to the Home. His hands full with the administration of the city, Mayor Courtenay still found time to correspond with the builders and the architect concerning roof-framing techniques, the amount of fill to be brought to the site, and the appropriate depth of the artesian well. Even as late as 1888 and 1889, Courtenay exchanged nearly twenty letters with the sculptor Edward Valentine regarding Valentine's commission for a bronze bust of Enston.

Clearly, the Enston Home was never intended as a typical poorhouse. In fact, from the outset it was planned as a showpiece. On August 9, 1882, the *Charleston News and Courier* reported that "the grounds . . . will be carefully laid out, and the object will be to make the William Enston Home an ornament to the City and an attraction for visitors, while fulfilling every practical use of the trust." "When fully developed," the 1883 *Yearbook* went on, the Enston Home "promises to be the most attractive charitable foundation in the Union. It will be the aim of the trustees to make it so" (99).

To understand why such rhetoric and attentions were lavished on the Enston Home, one should consider Charleston's physical and economic condition in the early 1880s. Charleston had been devastated by the Civil War. In his *Short History of Charleston*, Robert Rosen describes the city's declining fortunes and shabby appearance during the post-War era -- this despite the civic boosterism of the progressive, business-oriented Courtenay administration. Many war-damaged buildings were left unrepaired well into the 1880s (123-4; for further discussion of the War's impact on Charleston, see Don Doyle's *New Men, New Cities, New South*, 51-86). The city's economy too was badly damaged. In trying to rebuild it, Courtenay had made deep cuts in municipal expenditures. These cuts

resulted in still greater neglect and decay for the city's streets, sewers, schools, port and railroad facilities, etc. (Doyle, 60). Its buildings flattened, its economy and credit shattered, its confidence stripped, Charleston did not really get back on its feet until the end of the century, when the Navy rebuilt the city's harbor and constructed a major shipyard there, a move that resulted in the creation of thousands of new jobs.

In the face of this decline in services and morale, the Enston Home could be taken as proof -- an ornament, or a totem -- of the city's movement toward recovery. Only a city well on its way to recovery could afford to house its indigents in such style. (In this respect, it might even have been hoped by some city leaders to assuage the fears of nervous investors.) Prominently situated between King Street -- Charleston's main inbound artery -- and the South Carolina Railway line, the Home could be seen by almost everyone entering or exiting the city by land. Among the papers kept at Memorial Hall are numerous cards and letters -- from such places as New York, Boston, Washington, DC, New Jersey, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island -- requesting plans or information related to the model village seen during a visit to Charleston.

While the Home's round-arched brick cottages and chapel-like Memorial Hall today look rather quaint, they too should be seen as an emblem of this progressive demonstration. In the 1880s, following the lead of Henry Hobson Richardson's great New England churches and libraries (and his 1884-88 Allegheny County Courthouse), the Romanesque Revival became one of the most popular architectural styles in the country for all variety of government and institutional buildings. In Charleston, where whole neighborhoods leveled by the War (particularly in the area south of Broad Street) were rebuilt to replicate their ante-bellum forms, the use of this style was extremely rare. Its rarity makes its application at the Enston Home all the more significant, in that it suggested a deliberate turn away from the city's architectural and ideological past.

The Home was forward-looking from a planning standpoint as well. Following the success of Llewellyn Park -- Llewellyn Haskell's romantic, landscaped community begun just west of New York City in 1852 -- the form of American cities began to change. In 1859, the year of Enston's will, Philadelphia attorney S. G. Fisher described the situation in the following terms:

> Fresh air, space, trees, flowers, privacy, a convenient and tasteful house, can now be had for the same expense as a narrow and confined dwelling on a pavement, surrounded by brick walls and all the unpleasant sights and sounds of a crowded town. The advantages are so obvious that this villa and cottage life has become quite a passion and is producing a complete revolution in our habits (Roth, 1983, 76).

Cities had increasingly come to be perceived as overcrowded, disease-infested, and crime-ridden. With the development of American railroads after 1828, it became practical for the first time to commute between a city workplace and a country or suburban home. Many who could afford to now began moving out of the cities. (In this regard, it should be noted that, although they lived 2 miles from downtown, Enston Home residents were

connected to the city's horse-drawn, and later electric trolley system; by 1893, the *Yearbook* reported on the new stone "entrance lodge" for "the accommodation of residents, waiting for the street cars" [134].) One of the most famous and successful of these suburbs was Riverside, Illinois, built outside Chicago in 1868 by Frederick Law Olmstead and Calvert Vaux. As they explained the urban exodus in their preliminary report on Riverside,

> in the minds of great numbers of people . . . the advance . . . which has occurred in towns has been made at too great a sacrifice of certain advantages which can at present be only enjoyed by going out of them. . . . It thus becomes evident that the present outward tendency of town populations is not so much an ebb as a higher rise of the same flood, the end of which must be, not as a sacrifice of urban conveniences, but their combination with the special charms and substantial advantages of rural conditions of life. . . . no great town can exist without great suburbs (Roth, 1983, 194).

In communities like Riverside, architecture and landscape were carefully integrated to provide gracious, romantically arranged, village-like refuges for a well-heeled clientele. The Enston Home, with its twelve acres sited well outside the city center, its oak-shaded, stone-paved roadways, and its tidy Romanesque buildings, is directly related to picturesque, commuter suburbs like Riverside and Llewellyn Park. In this, it provides Charleston's only example of this type of late nineteenth-century, comprehensive suburban planning. There are two key differences between the Home and these other sites, however. One of these has already been noted -- i.e., that the Home's siting was regarded as an impetus to northward development, and that the city was expected to grow around it, which it did. A still more remarkable difference is that the Enston Home was built not for wealthy commuters, but for a population of elderly indigents.

For all the forward thinking involved in its conception and execution, on one quite fundamental level the Enston Home draws on a distant past. Ironically, in this too it was abreast of contemporary developments.

In his influential book *Contrasts*, 1836, British architect and moralist A. W. N. Pugin drew a devastating comparison between the architectural landscapes of contemporary and late medieval England. Most interesting for the present discussion is his illustration, published in the 1841 edition, showing "Contrasted Residences for the Poor." The nineteenth-century building is a nightmarish, panopticon-plan, prison workhouse, where inmates are chained, fed a meager diet, and guarded by a top-hatted, whip-toting master. At death they face the ultimate indignity of having their bodies carted away to the medical school dissection table. Pugin's "Antient Poor Hoyse," by comparison, is a stately Gothic pile, a quadrangle reminiscent of England's great medieval colleges, with neat rows of attached dwellings, well-tended gardens, and a cruciform chapel. Its benevolent masters administer Christian compassion, hearty meals, and decent burials to their grateful flock.

Whether Enston knew Pugin's work or not, his conception for the Home seems rooted in

the same social ferment -- what James Steven Curl, in his study of nineteenth century British philanthropic housing, calls "the growth of the Evangelical Conscience" (149). Enston had written that the purpose of his hospital was "to make old age comfortable," and in this it should be seen as a reaction to the comparably grim conditions then prevailing at the Charleston Poor House. The Enston Home does bear more than a passing resemblance to the almshouse favored by Pugin. Both developments are medieval in form -- Gothic and cloistered for the *Contrasts* illustration; Romanesque and detached for the Enston Home -- and both stand in marked opposition to then-current trends in low-income housing. In both cases, architectural forms associated with medieval religious building evoke an enlightened attitude toward the accommodation of the worthy poor.

As with Enston, it is not known if Mayor Courtenay and his fellow trustees knew Pugin's work. Nonetheless, they may have been at least indirectly influenced by it. Three of Charleston's Roman Catholic churches -- St. Patrick's (1886-7), the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist (1890-1907), and the earlier Cathedral of St. John and St. Finbar (1850-54, destroyed by fire in 1861) -- were built by the Irish-born architect Patrick Keely. According to an 1850 article in the *Charleston Mercury*, Keely was Pugin's only pupil working in the United States (Ravenel, 255). What is known is that Courtenay believed -- and was probably right in thinking -- that Enston's bequest had been inspired by the medieval almshouses in his native Canterbury, including the home established there in 1595 by his ancestor John Boys. It was to Canterbury's almshouses that the trustees turned for their organizational and architectural models.

On August 18, 1882, Courtenay wrote his first letter to G. R. Frend, Mayor of Canterbury, England. Courtenay wrote to inform Frend of the hospital endowed by this "native of your ancient and historic city." Enston's intention, he assured Frend, was for something "similar to one or more charitable foundations in Canterbury." He went on to ask for "information as you may have of the institutions in your city of like character, with such rules as may have been found useful with you."

Frend's response, dated September 1, stated that "we have several almshouses and at present I cannot find the one Mr. Enston seems to have had in mind." Nonetheless, in 1882, the trustees published fifty copies of a pamphlet titled *Papers Relating to Certain Charitable Foundations at Canterbury, England, the Originals Loaned by Alderman G. R. Frend, Mayor of Canterbury, for the Use of the Trustees of the William Enston Home.* This publication contained reprints of papers pertaining to the establishment and operation of various Canterbury foundations -- the Thanet and Gorelcy charities, Sir Roger Manwood's Hospital, the Charitable Trusts Act of 1853, with amendments of 1855, and Jesus Hospital. The document was circulated among the Enston board, and was apparently intended to guide them in developing the administrative apparatus of the Home.

During 1882 and 1883 Courtenay and Frend corresponded several more times. Frend sent the Charleston mayor a photograph of himself, as well as photographs and engravings of English medieval buildings, some of which were later reproduced and mounted on the walls of Memorial Hall. The most intriguing remnant of their exchange, however, and perhaps the most important formal source for the Enston Home, is a book titled *Rambles*

Around Old Canterbury. On November 11, 1882, Frend sent this book to Courtenay. Written by Francis Cross and published earlier that year, this volume was later presented by Courtenay, along with his other papers relating to the Enston Home, to the Charleston Library Society. It remains in their collection.

In the letter accompanying the book, Frend directed Courtenay to page 47 ("the Gateway of St. John's House Parish, Northgate, where Mr. Enston's father was born . . . it was visited by your friends"), and page 60 ("Hall of East Bridge Hospital, the first I took them to see"). While Courtenay's unnamed friends probably reported to him on what they saw, more concrete evidence for some type of formal inspiration is provided by the book itself. Several passages in it are highlighted with pencil marks in the margins. As the book has been protected by the Library Society since presented by Courtenay in 1906, these marks may well have been made by the mayor himself, or by someone to whom he loaned the book -- the Home's architect, for example. One of these marked passages, regarding the medieval Hospital of St. John, evokes an ambiance that is closely related in mood and arrangement, if not in formal particulars, to the Enston Home as later built:

> In the middle of busy Northgate there stands an interesting old house, timber-paneled and gable-roofed, over a fine wooden arch. We pass through this from the noisy street, and enter a quiet enclosure, a peaceful haven of repose. The green sward is framed in by gray rambling lines of buildings; some, the ruined remains of long past ages; others, the present homes of those who are themselves quietly dropping into decay. On the right is the old church, where the brothers and sisters, who are still able to get out, meet and worship. . . . this retreat from the cares and worries of the struggling world must ensure ripe old age (45-6).

A few pages on, Cross described the pleasurable scene presented by "the inmates" working in "their plots of garden" (50). Elsewhere, the book included illustrations of an "Old Bench-head, St. Mildred's" (whose finial is similar to those used on the west gable-ends of the Enston Home cottages [69]), the "Tower of the city wall, Dane John" (flat-roofed, though similarly proportioned to the Enston Home Water Tower [95]), and the "Westgate Towers" (much larger than, though similar in proportions to, the King Street Entrance Gate [96]). It seems quite possible that Courtenay, with his demonstrated interest in the Home's architectural development, would have passed the book along to the architect Howe. Unfortunately, Howe's contract for the Enston Home design has not been located, for it may well have included stylistic specifications.

Concerning their form, Enston himself had said only that, "These cottages must be built of brick, in rows, neat and convenient, two stories high, having each two rooms and a kitchen." Of the indignities suffered by residents of traditional almshouses, one of the worst was their unwholesome lack of privacy. According to Gwendolyn Wright, for "many Americans, any kind of shared dwelling seemed an aberration of the model home" (145). By the time of Enston's will, the nostalgic ideal of the detached, rural cottage on its own piece of ground was already pervasive among American urbanites, thanks largely to the tremendous popularity of pattern books like Calvert Vaux's 1857 *Cottages and Villas*, and

Andrew Jackson Downing's *Cottage Residences*, 1842 (in its thirteenth edition by 1887). Among other points, Downing advocated a southwest aspect, "all other things being equal," for "the finer rooms," brick construction and plaster over lath interior finishing, and attention to the "the porch, verandah, or piazza," which raises "the character of a cottage or villa above mediocrity" (Roth, 1983, 155-58). Again, it is not known whether Enston, Courtenay, or Howe consulted Downing's book. It is worth noting, however, that these features appear on the cottages of the Enston Home. A more thorough survey than has been possible here of pattern books like Downing's might yield the sources of its plans or various formal motifs.

Elsewhere this overview has dwelled on the unusual features of the Enston Home. The point in noting works such as Pugin's and Downing's is not so much to link them directly to the Home's design, as to describe the architectural landscape of which the Home was in many ways a typical part. Another intriguing volume from this period is J. Loudon's *Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm and Villa Architecture* (London, 1842). Considering the advantages of "double cottages," Loudon noted that they were

> built cheaper [and are] more picturesque. Besides, it adds to the comfort of the poor, to have a neighbour close at hand, in case of sickness. . . . there is a feeling of security and cheerfulness in having a near neighbour, especially to an old couple, who must often stand in need of assistance (184-85).

According to librarians at the Charleston Library Society, this book has most likely been on their shelves since the mid-nineteenth century, and so it may well have been available to any of the parties involved with the conception and design of the Enston Home.

Thus far, this discussion has been limited to developments at the Home predating 1890. Buildings erected there after this date were designed to complement the original structures, while incorporating current stylistic and technological trends. The first of these, the 1893 Entrance Gate was built of uncoursed granite rubble, in a version of the Romanesque Revival that is more massive and simple than that of the comparatively delicate, fussy, Queen Anne-influenced cottages; it was possibly influenced by such mature H. H. Richardson works as the Ames Gate Lodge or the Old Colony Depot (both built in North Easton, MA, in 1881). The 1927 cottages were closely modeled on the original 1887 buildings; while their programs and exterior forms are quite similar to the earlier buildings, their interior arrangements demonstrate a more rational, functional approach to design (see HABS No. SC-686-B for a detailed discussion of these differences). Finally, the 1933 Infirmary, reflecting the cottages in scale, materials (red brick with concrete), and many formal details (e.g., the front porch and round-arched front window), also exhibits characteristics that seem drawn from bungalow-style architecture (e.g., the jerkinhead gable roof and sun porch).

D. The Operation of the Enston Home:

As noted above, since 1882, the government of the Enston Home has been in the hands of a self-perpetuating, twelve-member board of trustees. Though independent, the board reports annually to the city council, and includes as an ex-officio thirteenth member the mayor of Charleston. New trustees, nominated by the board itself, must be residents of Charleston County. Members rotate between various standing committees, including the executive committee and those dealing with finances, applications, buildings and grounds, and rules and by-laws. Officers are elected once a year; meetings are held once each month at Memorial Hall (though in the nineteenth century, the board met twice each month). While there have as yet been no female trustees, the current board is considering women candidates for its upcoming positions.

Since its opening in 1888, day-to-day management of the Home has been the responsibility of a paid, live-in superintendent. The superintendent makes monthly reports to the board on the health of the inmates (as they are sometimes still called), the condition of the property, and the repairs and supplies needed. Thomas Bonnell was the first superintendent. He was followed by "Miss Lula Bonnell" (his sister?). Since that time, most superintendents have been women. Past superintendents include Matilda H. Westmoreland (1901-1913), M. Caroline Robertson (1910s), O. H. Clarke (1930s), and A. C. Grooms (1960s). Along with his or her other duties, the superintendent oversees the staff, which currently consists of two groundskeepers. In the past, the Home also employed a resident doctor (who lived in one of the cottages), a nurse, and security guard (at the turn of the century this position was filled by a Charleston city police officer).

In 1884 the board published what appears to be its first "Rules of the Board of Trustees and Roles of Officers and Committees." An 1889 edition of this was expanded to include rules concerning the superintendent's duties, as well as the admission and conduct of inmates. Here it was stated that the superintendent would live on-site, keep regular office hours at Memorial Hall (and be available "to answer telephone calls"), inspect every cottage at least every two days, report monthly to the board on the condition of the property, report immediately any inmate complaints, and be paid $40 per month. While his predecessors were assigned one of the cottage units, current superintendent Paul Helton is the first to live in the former Infirmary.

Though neither William nor Hannah Enston left any record of their views on the subject, their grand-niece, Jessie Butler (who lived at the Home from 1956 until her death in 1975) did provide her criteria for the ideal superintendent. In a letter to board member James Howe, dated February 3, 1969, Butler wrote: "A superintendent should be a lady or a gentleman, educated, with an understanding of and sympathy for elderly people. She should play no favorites, be kind but firm." It was Butler's opinion that of all the superintendents she had known -- and she claimed to have known them all -- Lula Bonnell was the one most suited for the job.

Superintendent Westmoreland's monthly reports, dating from between 1901 and 1906, are preserved among the records at Memorial Hall, and together they provide an vivid picture

of the Home's day-to-day operations in its early years. Most of these reports were taken up with information on the inmates' health, their deaths and departures, vacancies, the condition of buildings and grounds, and requests for wood, oil, and repairs. Sometimes, however, Westmoreland's letters adopted a surprisingly personal tone. Her devotion to the Home and the inmates came through at these moments, and while she generally found the place in good order and the inmates in good health, her words could betray the stress of the job. Indeed, caring for such a large facility and so many elderly and infirm people must often have been a difficult task, especially with the small staff the Home maintained. "I am very anxious for the Trustees to give us a Physician for the Home," Westmoreland wrote on September 23, 1902, "as I have upon several occasions seen the ladies very much neglected in sickness, and often it is hard to get a doctor here when needed." On February 26, 1906, she wrote that "our nurse . . . has really broken down from hard work." In July 1906, when Westmoreland went on vacation, her sister, S. R. Kinlock, filled in for her. In her report for July 6, Kinlock concluded by saying, "I will try not to worry, but go on and do my best, until I turn the duties over to my sister, which will be very soon now, and I am sure it will be a relief to me -- for it is not a very enviable position to fill."

The terms of admission contained in the 1889 "Rules of the Board" were virtually identical with those specified in Enston's will (i.e., that inmates be "old and infirm, in poverty, of good, honest character, and decent, over the age of forty-five years, . . . no(t) lunatic(s), . . . (and) residents of the city of Charleston"). The earliest applications for admission to the Home included an extract from Enston's will, and a statement regarding the benefits offered. Applicants were asked to provide their names, current address, address for the past ten years, age, place of birth, marital status, names of close relatives, means of support and other financial resources, and three local references. (Current application forms are nearly identical to these originals.) Several early applications are preserved among the board's records at Memorial Hall. A fairly typical example, dated April 24, 1889, is that of Isabella E. Taylor. On her form, Taylor wrote that she was 69 years of age, a widow, with "no settled home, and . . . entirely destitute." She claimed that her income was derived from "what I can earn by sewing . . . My son helps to support me, but he is abroad, at present in Arizona." Her application was accepted. By February 1889 the Home's nineteen cottages were already full, housing about sixty inmates.

Benefits for successful applicants included lodging, fuel for cooking and heating, water, and lights -- all provided free of charge. These benefits are still provided, though since July 1980, a $20 -- now $40 -- monthly operational fee has been charged to offset the increased cost of utilities. Residents pay an additional $120 per annum for optional air conditioning. Then as now, inmates were expected to have enough regular income -- usually derived from a pension or savings, or sometimes provided by a sponsor -- to pay for their own clothing, food, and major medical expenses. The *News and Courier* for February 23, 1889, reported that the Home employed a resident physician "who occupies one of the cottages, and attends to the inmates" (8). (Westmoreland's September 23, 1906, report, cited above, indicated that this doctor was no longer in attendance.) In 1933 the Infirmary was added to provide care for minor medical conditions and a place for convalescence. A rule book issued in 1938 stated that inmates using the infirmary were to be charged $15 per month to cover the cost of meals. Medicines and surgical dressings

were not covered, and no acutely or chronically ill inmates, those whose sickness required bed treatment, were to be admitted.

Rules for inmates in 1889 were simple and brief. It was demanded only that they share common spaces in the cottages, keep the facilities clean and free of damage (taking special care with the water closet and bath), notify the superintendent when planning to be absent overnight, and have no pets apart from cats or caged birds. Amendments and additions to these rules were published or noted periodically, and these became increasing complicated.

Following the renovations of 1927, notices were passed out to the inmates pertaining to the exact type and quantity of furniture they were allowed to have in the cottages. A note posted in all the cottages, dated May 8, 1928, limited inmate furniture to the following items: bedrooms -- 1 bed, 1 bureau, 1 wardrobe, 1 washstand, 1 table, 2 chairs, 1 rocker; kitchens -- 1 table, 2 chairs, and necessary cooking utensils; halls -- 1 small table, and 2 chairs for each occupant. No papers were to be accumulated anywhere in the cottages and no nails were to be driven in the walls. The 1938 rule book stated that in addition to being over 45, applicants must now be under 75 and have sufficient furniture and enough assured income to provide their own food and clothing (though trustee notes on applications indicate that this last part was an unwritten rule almost from the beginning). The list of forbidden items in 1938 included musical instruments, radios (unless approved by all cottage inmates), and kerosene or gas heating stoves. No electric outlets or sockets were to be used for "fans, electric irons, or motors." By 1955, board meeting minutes record that "no one receiving help from the Welfare Department may be admitted to the Home" (though by the mid 1970s, if not sooner, some inmates were receiving welfare payments and food stamps). In 1956 "it was decided that inmates be not allowed to keep automobiles in the grounds."

In 1987, twenty-two-year resident Mary Jurs recounted how when she had first visited the Home several years previously, she found the rules too strict. Since that time, according to Jurs, "they relaxed the rules . . . I like to be independent. I'm content here" (*Evening Post*, March 10, 1987, 1-A). Residents may now park their cars in front of their homes and use all variety of electric appliances. A memo dated June 21, 1966, stated that in addition to the gas cooking stove and living room space heater provided by the Home, inmates were now allowed to have a refrigerator, television, radio, fan, toaster, coffee pot, iron, mixer, and sewing machine. Washing machines, air conditioners, and electric frying pans were still forbidden at that time, though at present, several residents do have air-conditioning units.

One fairly recent provision of the Enston Home is its Golden Age Club, which operated throughout the 1960s. Organized in 1959 by the local Benefactors' Club, the Golden Age Club was described in a letter of May 14, 1966. In essence, it was designed to provide Home inmates with such entertainments as slide shows, craft classes, religious programs, and musical and theatrical events. Golden Age Club members were also invited to participate in community service projects, such as marching in a cancer walkathon and making and mending clothes and blankets for various area homes and hospitals.

In 1957, the Home's seventy-fifth anniversary year, resident Hortense Fitzgerald wrote a brief profile of the Home, in which she stated that "there may never be more that 20 residents of any one denomination." It is not known just when this policy was first put in place. Though Enston himself imposed no racial or sectarian restrictions on the Home's population, it must be recalled that he was writing before Emancipation, and may never have considered it likely that anyone but Caucasians would apply. During the twentieth century, racial restrictions may -- and probably were -- in effect, but there is nothing in the documents surveyed for this report which mentions them by name. In the board's minutes for October 1974, it was recorded that the president was contacted by an agent from the F.B.I., "because of a complaint prompted by a statement in a United Fund publication that the Home was restricted to white residents." The record went on to say that the United Fund was immediately contacted in order to have "this erroneous statement deleted from the publication." One board member, however, has recently stated that the first African-American inmates were admitted sometime within the last ten years, possibly owing to the fact that none had previously applied.

It was suggested earlier that William Enston conceived of the Home as a benevolent alternative to the city almshouse. One measure of the Home's success comes from speaking with current residents or reading the letters of their predecessors. While complaints about maintenance or neighbors pepper the record, as they would with any place housing nearly one hundred people, residents over the years have generally been quite satisfied with their accommodations, and the waiting list of applicants has sometimes been several years long. One grateful resident was Ida Kampaux. In November 1913, Kampaux wrote to the trustees to inform them of her intention to leave the Home in order to go care for her ill sister. She said that she was "leaving with deep regret," and thanked the board for "the many kind privelges (sic) and indulgences permitted" her, and asked that if she "ever need(ed) a home again that you will not refuse to make 'Old Age Comfortable.'"

In September 1991, it was announced that the board was negotiating the sale of the King Street property to the Charleston Housing Authority. This transaction has yet to be completed, but the Housing Authority is making plans to renovate existing structures and build thirteen new cottages with the same massing, footprint, and scale as the original cottages. The revitalized site will continue to provide low-income rental housing, plus low-cost homes for first-time buyers, transitional housing for the homeless, and permanent housing for the handicapped and mentally ill. Usage will be mixed and the land will not be subdivided. The area between the Infirmary and the Memorial Hall will remain open and undeveloped, preserving the open, rural feel of the site. Among other options, the Enston board is considering purchasing property nearby on which to construct a new facility for the community they have always served. Enston Home residents (currently numbering thirty-four, down from a capacity crowd of nearly one hundred in the early 1980s) would have the option of staying on at the remodeled King Street site or moving to the new Home.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. Architectural Character:

For physical histories and descriptions of individual Enston Home buildings see the accompanying HABS reports.

Considered separately, the cottages -- in their massing, scale, and individual features (e.g., chimneys, porch, small doors and windows) -- read as residential. Taken as a whole, the site is given a rather institutional character, however benign, through the uniformity of the buildings, their arrangement in rows, and their orientation (all facing front to back toward the southwest, rather than face to face across the streets). The massive Entrance Gate frames the view of Memorial Hall and the axis of Canterbury Avenue, providing both a monumental entrance and a sense of seclusion to the Home. Inside the gate, an internal grid of roads links the buildings to one another. With three streets parallel and one perpendicular to King Street, this network is paved with granite Belgian blocks and red brick, with slate flagstone curbs and sidewalks.

More than the sum of its parts, it is the overall scheme of the Enston Home that is of interest and value. A late nineteenth century interpretation of a medieval English village, combined with then-current notions of healthful suburban living, the Enston Home is an early and possibly unique example of privately-funded, non-denominational, American philanthropic housing. At the time it was built, housing for the elderly poor commonly consisted of crowded almshouses (which often shared space with prison workhouses and insane asylums) or squalid tenements. By contrast, the spacious, picturesque grounds and cottages of the Enston Home offered their indigent population a dignified, comfortable, well-maintained, modern residence.

B. Condition of Fabric:

The condition of the buildings ranges from poor to good. The Water Tower (its roof removed in 1988) and Memorial Hall tower are both in poor condition. Filled with rotting wood and nesting pigeons, they pose serious health and safety risks. On September 21, 1989, Hurricane Hugo hit Charleston, causing extensive damage to Home buildings and landscape alike. The roofs of the cottages and Infirmary were redone, and while this has prevented further water damage from occurring, the repairs were not entirely in accordance with the historical integrity of the site. Most other repairs have been postponed while the Enston Home Board negotiates the transfer of the property to the Charleston Housing Authority. No new residents have been admitted to the Home since 1989, so many cottages now stand vacant. Several interiors, including that of No. 2 (documented herewith) are quite shabby and neglected. Cottage exteriors, however, with the exception of some boarded-up windows and broken gable finials, appear generally sound. The grounds are regularly mowed, but now have a rather overgrown, untended appearance.

C. Site, Landscape Design, and Internal Street Grid:

The site currently consists of 12.1 acres, located at the northeast corner of King and Huger Streets. The north line, from King Street to the east line, measures 818'; the east line, from the north line to Huger Street is 734'; the south line, parallel to Huger Street, is 551'; the west line, running parallel to King Street, measures 890'. Most of the original structural features of the Home are extant.

Enston's will specified that "the City of Charleston must furnish not less than eight acres of ground" for the purpose of locating the Home. To this end, eight acres were purchased from the farm of Michael Storen on August 10, 1882. (Storen himself had bought the property on April 10, 1873, from the estate of Joseph Blake, whose family had owned a large tract of land in that area since at least 1800.) An additional 3.25 acres were bought from the estate of Joseph Rutledge on February 1, 1884, and seven more acres east of the Home site were added in a purchase of December 5, 1887. Finally, a piece of land consisting of about one acre, extending the site south to Huger Street, was acquired sometime between 1902 and 1921. The eastern acreage, between the railroad tracks and Meeting Street, was originally rented out as a tenant farm. Part of this land was sold in 1963 to the South Carolina State Highway Department; another portion of it was used on into the 1970s as a dump-site for the Home.

As early as 1882 it was planned to erect forty cottages on the site, with ample land around each for gardens (in accordance with Enston's will), and space reserved at the center for a monument to Enston. In 1884, more than 20,000 cubic yards of solid earth fill were brought to the site via rail (at a cost of 16 cents per cubic yard), and grading, filling and the laying in of drains and roadways began. The 1883 *Yearbook* reported that, when filled, the site would "be the highest body of land in the city" (98). By 1885, a wood fence had been built around the property and an artesian well was dug in its northeast corner. Road paving blocks were delivered and ready for placement at this time, and it was expected that the Home would open its doors within a year and a half. A devastating earthquake of 1886, though doing little damage to site, immediately drew workers away to more pressing tasks. By August 1887, however, the first five cottages were in place. The sewage system, water tower, windmill, and engine house were also built by the end of that year. An additional fourteen cottages and the Memorial Hall were completed in 1888. With the exception of the windmill and the original fence, all of these structures still stand on the eastern half of the property.

Four internal roads were built on the site -- three running parallel to King Street, and one perpendicular to it. The lateral, north to south roads are (in west to east order), Queen Bertha's Court, Colsterworth Avenue (continuing past Memorial Hall to the southern half of the property), and St. Augustine's Court. A paved walkway, St. Martin's Court, runs adjacent to King Street, between it and the first row of cottages. Canterbury Avenue, the perpendicular, east-to-west lane, runs from the King Street Entrance Gate (built in 1893) to the eastern perimeter of the site (where a brick post entrance gate is now entirely overgrown). Roads were paved with granite Belgian blocks, while blue slate flagstones were used for the walkways. All original paving is still in place. Several letters dating

from the mid-1960s make reference to the board's sale of these flagstones (buyers included the Historic Charleston Foundation's Russell House and Grace Episcopal Church), but it is not clear just where on the property these might have been pulled from.

While the Belgian block streets today give the Home a quaint, picturesque appearance, in keeping with the medieval revival architecture, this is not how they would have appeared in 1880s Charleston. Until 1879, barely a third of the city's streets were paved, and most of these with nothing more than wood planks, bricks, or shells. Well over half of the city's 53.5 miles of roads were nothing more than dirt. Upon taking office in 1879, Mayor Courtenay began a drive to pave the city's roads with granite Belgian blocks, and over the next few years, some 94,000 square yards of these were laid down, mostly on the principal streets south of Calhoun. At the same time, the old shell sidewalks were replaced by flagstone walks and curbing (Fraser, 304). At the time of their completion then, the Enston Home's paved walks and roadways were Charleston-style state of the art.

An untitled, undated document, found among papers dating from the early 1880s, discussed plans for the site and buildings, and suggested that until the open southern half of the site could be developed according to plan, it might be used by inmates for the grazing of cattle. It is unknown if this grazing ever took place. The *News and Courier* for February 23, 1889, reported that the Home's "twenty" cottages (the actual number was nineteen) were occupied by about sixty inmates, and that work on the next twenty cottages would soon begin -- starting later that year with five cottages along King Street on the southern end of the property. Almost forty years later, in 1927, these five new King Street cottages, and two new roads, were finally built. The new roads were paved with vitrified brick and in 1965 named Shuttlewood Avenue (after Hannah Enston's maiden name; sometimes mistakenly called "Shutterwood Avenue") and Dawson Street (after Harriet Dawson, donor of the Infirmary). The Dawson Infirmary was built in 1933, and in 1935, a new gate was added to provide access between Shuttlewood Avenue and Huger Street.

Superintendents' reports from over the years cite numerous instances of trees felled by high winds. It is not known exactly what the original landscaping consisted of, though postcards dating from around 1910 show the site looking much as it does now (though somewhat better maintained). Current flora includes grass, southern pines, magnolias, oleanders, azaleas, and many fine old oaks. Enston's will stated that space should be allotted around each cottage for inmate gardens, and many residents still take advantage of this provision. One man, for example, has planted several banana trees in his yard. At present though, the site has an overgrown appearance, especially in its southeast quadrant, and the hedge surrounding the property is wild and unkempt.

It should be noted that the siting of the cottages, facing but slightly angled away from King Street and staggered back from one another, was first proposed in engineer Rudolph Hering's 1886 *Report on a System of Sewage for the William Enston Home* (9-10). From Hering's report it appears that the original plan was to have the cottages all facing north. Hering proposed a southwest orientation for reasons relating to aesthetics, prevailing wind patterns, and ease and economy in the connection of water pipes. His suggestions in this

regard were followed to the letter.

D. Rudolph Hering and the Home's Sewage and Water System:

During the second half of the ninetcenth century, as medical science provided increasingly strong evidence for the germ theory of disease, sanitation and the proper disposal of waste materials became causes for widespread concern in the United States. One indication of this interest was the commencement of publication, on February 12, 1878, of the journal *The Plumber and Sanitary Engineer.* As its editors stated on the front page of every issue, "The aim of this paper is distinctly to ENLIGHTEN THE PUBLIC regarding the essentials of House Drainage and Water Supply. IT IS NOT A TRADE PAPER . . . It should be read by all people who either build houses or who live in them."

In low-lying Charleston, health and sanitation have long been major concerns. A report on the city's drainage difficulties in *The Sanitary Engineer,* dated November 1, 1880, noted that "the city is certainly underlaid by a very unwholesome stratum" (462). Dedicated to making "old age comfortable," the Enston Home's board of trustees naturally gave considerable attention to modifying this environment and providing a safe, healthy environment, and a modern system of sewers and drains for the welfare of their elderly inmates.

To design the Home's sewage system, the board brought in civil and sanitary engineer Rudolph Hering of Philadelphia. A regular contributor to *The Sanitary Engineer,* Hering was also the most prominent designer associated with the Enston Home. Among his many publications listed in the Library of Congress card catalog are reports and plans detailing sewage and water systems for New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and numerous other cities in the United States, Canada, and Brazil. In 1885 Hering reported to the National Board of Health and the U.S. Congress on European sewage systems. A year later, he was named Chief Engineer of the Water-Supply and Drainage Commission of Chicago. *The Sanitary Engineer* characterized him as "a very capable man who acquired a splendid reputation . . . through his work for the National Government and as consulting engineer in Eastern cities" (June 11, 1887, 46).

The 1889 *Proceedings* described Hering's "sewerage system" for the Home as "plain in material, and simple in design and construction, and . . . as nearly perfect as careful attention to detail good material and workmanship can make it" (46). Hering himself discussed the system in his *Report on a System of Sewerage for the William Enston Home, Charleston, S.C.,* published in Charleston, in 1886. Originally included with this report, but now missing, were plans of the grounds and sewers, drawings and models of the manholes, a section drawing of the cottages, and a plan and section for the water tower. The following is a summary of the text.

Hering began the report by stating that, given the low elevation of the Home site, the "only feasible scheme for the final disposal (of sewage) is to turn it into an open water course, by which it can be held in suspension, thoroughly diluted and carried away." Hering recommended that wastes be channeled into then-nearby New Market Creek,

which itself drained into the Cooper River on the city's east side. Outlets into the creek were to be placed at a level of one foot above low water, so that they would be "completely emptied at each low tide" -- twice each day.

The two main sewers, leading from the southwest and northwest corners of the grounds, were designed to carry sewage -- i.e., water from the sinks, tubs, and toilets. Rain water was carried away by a separate system of drains. Pipes in the main sewers were to be 8" in diameter, those in the branch sewers 6" and those connecting the branches with the buildings 4". Hering stated that these sewer lines were to be perfectly straight, accessible by manholes, and adequately ventilated by fresh-air inlets. Regarding materials, he specified hard-burnt, salt-glazed pipes, laid on good foundations and joined with hydraulic cement mortar. Manholes were to be of brick, laid in cement mortar, plastered on the outside, with iron covers and brass-nozzled water-pipes.

Within the buildings, only two rooms, the kitchen and the bathroom/water-closet, were to receive water and drainage appliances. (It should be noted that while Hering mentions only one kitchen per cottage, the buildings were, in fact, built with two; presumably the plans were altered sometime between Hering's 1886 report and Howe's statement in the 1887 *Yearbook.*) Hering advised the installation of square-topped, double-flushing, hopper-type toilets (costing about $25 to $30 each), copper bathtubs with hot and cold water spigots ($18 to $25), and iron sinks for the kitchens ($4 to $6). Sinks were to be bracketed to the wall with the space beneath left open. All fixtures were to have traps "as near to (them) as practicable," and all pipes were to be laid in such a matter that they could be seen and inspected at any time.

As initially conceived, the Home's system provided water to the cottages from two different sources. Rain water for drinking and cooking purposes was to be collected from the cottage roofs, channeled down gutters, and stored in basement cisterns. An artesian well sited in the northeast corner of the property was to provide water for washing, flushing, etc. Hering specified that a large wrought-iron storage tank, elevated 20' above the ground to enable the gravity-feeding of water to the second stories of the cottages, be built. Water would be carried from the tank to each of the cottages over four 4" pipes. Hering recommended building a tower around the tank, with a slate floor, four high, narrow, barred windows for ventilation, walls and belt courses of molded brick, a heavy oak door, terra-cotta ornament, and an inscription plate of stone or terra-cotta. This, in effect, describes the Water Tower as built.

Water was to be pumped from the well to the tank by "a good American Windmill with a 14 or 16 foot wheel." For calm days, a gas or steam-driven pump was to be provided. These pumps were to be housed near the well in a storage shed, "with a siding connecting the grounds with the South Carolina Railway."

Hering advised flushing the sewers with well water "as often as possible, and at least once a week." Finally, to test the tightness of the system -- its containment of noxious vapors -- he recommended placing "smoke rockets" or oil of peppermint into the sinks and toilets and then sealing them: if no smoke or odor escaped, the system should be considered safe.

One other significant passage in the report contains recommendations for the repositioning of the buildings. Hering's advice on this point is discussed above in section C. Virtually all of his recommendations were followed to the letter.

Home superintendent M. H. Westmoreland's report for June 24, 1901, mentions inmate complaints of cistern water causing illness. On February 13, 1908, the houses were tapped into the city mains, at which point the cisterns were probably drained and sealed (as they are now). It may also have been about this time that the artesian well was capped and the windmill taken down.

E. Outbuildings:

The Water Tower and Engine House were noted in the 1887 Charleston *Yearbook* (see HABS Nos. SC-686-E and SC-686-G). Also mentioned in this *Yearbook* are a windmill (demolished) and artesian well (capped, but still visible). These were located along the northern edge of the property, just west of the Engine House. Additionally, a letter from William Courtenay dated April 29, 1892, states that, "to provide an additional water supply, a very large surface well has been sunk, and it has been made, as well, a reservoir for the subsoil drainage of the ground . . . there is always 20 to 30,000 galls. of water in the reservoir, which is supplied with a convenient cover, and is available for a fire engine." According to the 1902 Sanborn map, this well was located directly behind (east) of cottage No. 1.

The 1893 *Yearbook* cites the addition of the Entrance Gate (HABS No. SC-686-F). In a note separate from that for the Gate, the *Yearbook* also mentions an expenditure of $2,714.47 for "Administration, erection of small building at the Home and sundry expenses." The location and function of this structure are unknown.

An overgrown hedge closes off the southern and western edges of the property. Along the northern and eastern perimeters runs a chain-link fence with concrete posts. Also found along the north and east sides are some old brick fence and gate posts: single posts in the northeast and southeast corners, two posts at the eastern terminus of Canterbury Avenue, and three at the eastern end of the northern property line. These last three may mark the location of a railroad siding which once approached the Engine House.

F. Electric Lighting of Grounds:

In his 1882 report, "Some suggestions looking to the founding of the Model Village . . . ," Mayor Courtenay proposed electric lighting for the Enston Home grounds, powered, if necessary, by an on-site source. By this time, the United States Electric Illuminating Company of Charleston, organized in November 1881, was operating from a building at 94 Queen Street. The company was headed by Enston Home Trustee Frank S. Rodgers.

In a letter to the mayor and aldermen of Charleston dated April 29, 1892, Courtenay, then President of the Enston Board of Trustees, wrote that "although Electric lighting on King Street has been extended as far as this locality and beyond, no lights have yet been placed

in the streets of the village . . . The Trustees would be pleased to have this omission supplied, if only for one light." No records have been found to date with certainty the initial electrification of the Home, although Superintendent Westmoreland, in her report for December 23, 1901, wrote that "the electric light at the front gate seldom works." This may still have been the only electric light on the grounds, probably placed there shortly after Courtenay's 1892 request.

A group of documents dated between October 1904 and June 1905 is of interest in this regard. A letter of October 5, 1904, from W. W. Fuller of the Charleston Consolidated Railway, Gas and Electric Company to William Enston Butler (William Enston's nephew) discussed lighting the grounds: "The cost for wiring the grounds, placing all necessary poles, running wires, etc., will be $100. The lights will burn all night, or from dark until daylight." On December 27, 1904, Superintendent Westmoreland wrote that "everybody is delighted at the prospect of having electric lights on the grounds." By March 22, 1905, the president of the electric company wrote to board member F. E. Taylor to say that "the gang is engaged today in hauling the poles to the Enston Home. Mr. Fuller promises me to complete the work this week."

Finally, on June 3, letters were exchanged by F. B. Krepps of the Electric Supply Co. and F. E. Taylor regarding a proposed change in the placement of the Home's street light system. Krepps' letter included a bid of $176.80 for relocating the poles (rejected by Taylor), and a hand-drawn map showing the current and proposed location of the poles. Eight then-current poles are shown (two on each street, in front of the cottages), with an additional sixteen proposed. The 1905 *Yearbook* was the first to mention the Home's being electrically lit.

G. Insurance Policies and Property Values Prior to 1900:

Fragments of insurance policy papers were found among the records kept at Memorial Hall. Policy No. 949, from the Springfield Fire and Marine Insurance Company, is dated August 22, 1887. It was for the amount of $5,500 on "5 brick dwellings in course of construction, $500 ea. on nos. 1,2,4,5 + $3,500 on no. 3/ $3,000 other ins. ea. on 1,2,4,5." Orient Insurance Company policy Nos. 501, 517, and 532 (dated July 19, September 19, and October 19, 1887) were for "$12,000 on four brick and trimmed dwellings in course of construction/ $3,000 on ea. dwelling." Interestingly enough, all policies were made out to the contractor of these first five cottages, W. F. Bowe.

In a letter dated April 29, 1892, Mayor Courtenay valued the Enston Home property and buildings at "nearly $150,000."

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural Drawings:

No original architect's plans or drawings of these buildings were located.

B. Maps and Early Views:

In addition to the documents cited below, early images of the Enston Home can be found in the following: *Charleston Yearbook*, 1887; *The Pine Forest Echo*, July 15, 1892; *Proceedings on the Occasion of the Dedication of Memorial Hall and the Unveiling of Valentine's Bronze Bust of William Enston at The Home, on the 22d February, 1889.* All items listed in this section, except plat maps and post cards, are available at the Charleston County Library Main Branch.

Bird's Eye View of the City of Charleston, South Carolina, 1872. Drawn and published by C. Drie.

Charleston, South Carolina. Sanborn Fire Insurance Company, 1902, 1956.

City of Charleston, South Carolina. New York: J.W. Colton, 1855.

Map of Charleston, Prepared to Accompany Mayor Courtenay's Centennial Address, August 13, 1883. Included with the *Charleston Yearbook*, 1884.

Map of Charleston, S.C. Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, ca. 1882.

"William Enston Home," color postcards, ca. 1910. South Carolina Historical Society (file #30-01, "900 King St."), 100 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC.

William Enston Home, plat maps. Gedney M. Howe, surveyor. September 1, 1921, March 15, 1941. Copies available at the Enston Home, 900 King Street, Charleston, SC.

C. Interviews:

Paul Helton, June 11, 1993, July 9, 1993, Enston Home, 900 King, Charleston, SC.

Robert Stockton, June 19, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

Robert Myers, June 23, 1993, Enston Home, 900 King Street, Charleston, SC.

Eugene Geer, June 24, 1993, July 21, 1993, August 11, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

James Howe, July 2, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

Chris Staubbs, July 12, 1993, Second Presbyterian Church, 342 Meeting Street, Charleston,

SC.

Arthur Howe, July 16, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

Ben Macmillan, July 21, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

Bill Scarborough, July 21, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

William Cogswell, July 21, 1993 (telephone), Charleston, SC.

D. Bibliography:

1. Primary and Unpublished Sources:

Charleston City Directories, Charleston, SC, 1880-1930.

College of Charleston Catalogues, 1896-99. Special Collections, College of Charleston, SC. Information pertaining to architect W. B. W. Howe, Jr.'s college years.

Courtenay, William A. "Some Suggestions looking to the founding of the Model Village, to be known as the William Enston Home, in Ward 10, in this city." 1882. Copies available at the South Carolina Historical Society, the Charleston Library Society, and the Enston Home.

Cross, Francis. *Rambles Around Old Canterbury*. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1882. W. A. Courtenay's personal copy, sent by Canterbury mayor G. R. Frend, is available at the Charleston Library Society, 164 King Street, Charleston, SC.

Grantor/Grantee Books and Deed Books, 1881-1900 (H16, 573; L 20, 48; V18, 542; Z19, 273). Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance, 2 Courthouse Square, Charleston, SC.

Hering, Rudolph. *Report on a System of Sewage for the William Enston Home, Charleston, S.C.* Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, 1886. Copy available among the board's papers at the Enston Home.

Manuscript and clippings files (#30-01, #30-04, #43-253, #51-550/560), South Carolina Historical Society, 100 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC.

"Memorial to Enston: The Dream of the Kentish Lad Finds its Fulfillment." *Charleston News and Courier*, February 23, 1889, 8.

Papers of the Board of Trustees of the William Enston Home, 900 King Street, Charleston, SC. Includes board meeting minutes, superintendents' reports, correspondence (including letters by Courtenay, the architect Howe, and the

contractor Bowe), applications, rules and regulations, financial records, insurance papers, contracts and specifications, a copy of Enston's will, and other related materials dating between 1882 and the early 1980s.

Papers of William Ashmead Courtenay. Letters to Courtenay from Edward Valentine (vols. I, II, IV, V, VI). Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

Papers Relating to Certain Charitable Foundations at Canterbury England. The Originals Loaned By Alderman G. R. Frend, Mayor of Canterbury, for the Use of the Trustees of the William Enston Home. Charleston: Walker, Evans and Cogswell, 1882. Copies available at the South Carolina Historical Society, the Charleston Library Society, and the Enston Home.

Poston, Jonathan H. "Grant Application for Survey and Planning Activities: Enston Home Survey and Nomination." South Carolina Department of Archives and History State Historic Preservation Office, October 15, 1991.

Proceedings on the Occasion of the Dedication of Memorial Hall and the Unveiling of Valentine's Bronze Bust of William Enston at The Home, on the 22d February, 1889. Charleston: Walker, Evans, and Cogswell, 1889. Included here are reprints of newspaper articles discussing Enston's death and funeral, and the most detailed available biography of Enston (written by Charleston attorney J. P. Kennedy Bryan, and delivered in a speech of February 22, 1889; see pp. 19-36).

Stoddard, Belle H. Letter to Jonathan H. Poston. July 13, 1993, Birmingham, AL.

'To Make Old Age Comfortable': Original Letters and Papers Relating to the Settlement of the Wm. Enston Bequest to the City of Charleston, 1860, Effected with Mrs. Hannah Enston, Executrix, 1881-82. Original documents collected, bound, and presented to the Charleston Library Society by William A. Courtenay, 1906. 164 King Street, Charleston, SC.

Ward Books, 1902-25. Charleston County Auditor's Office, 2 Courthouse Square, Charleston, SC.

Yearbooks of the City of Charleston, S.C., 1880-1951. Copies available at the Charleston County Library Main Branch, the Charleston Library Society, and the City of Charleston Archives.

2. Secondary and Published Sources on the Enston Home:

Allen, Jane E. "King St. Buildings a Little Bit of 19th-Century England." *Charleston News and Courier*, January 17, 1983.

Charleston South Carolina in 1883. Boston: Heliotype Printing Company, 1883, 37.

Entry on the Enston Home.

Charleston, S.C. and Vicinity, South Carolina Inter-State and West Indian Exposition. Charleston, 1901, 126. Information on building contractor Robert McCarrel.

"Do You Know Your Charleston: The Enston Home." *Charleston News and Courier*, March 28, 1932.

"Extracts From the Schirmer Diary, 1860." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 61 (1960): 163.

Lesemann, Charles. "William Enston's Bequest." *The State Magazine*, February 19, 1950, 10.

Morgan, Kerri. "Enston Homes to become agency's newest project." *Charleston Post-Courier*, September 7, 1991.

"Philanthropist Never Forgot British Roots." *Charleston Evening Post*, March 10, 1987, 1-A.

Shealy, H. Jane. "100-Year-Old Home Legacy of William Enston." *Charleston Evening Post*, March 10, 1987, 1-A.

Stockton, Robert P. *The Great Shock: The Effects of the 1886 Earthquake on the Built Environment of Charleston, S.C.* Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1986.

Wells, John E., and Robert E. Dalton. *The South Carolina Architects, 1885-1935.* Richmond: New South Architectural Press, 1992.

"William Enston Home Called 'Place for Old-Age Comfort.'" *Charleston News and Courier*, June 14, 1965.

"William Enston Home." *Pine Forest Echo*, July 15, 1892, 103-07.

"Worthy Proposal for Enston Homes." *The Charleston Evening Post*, September 11, 1991.

3. General Secondary Sources:

"$500 Competition for a Model House for Working People." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, December 1878, 32, January 1879, 34, March 1879, 89-106.

Abstract of the Fifteenth Census of the United States. Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1930, 182.

Birch, Eugenie Ladner, and Deborah S. Gardner. "The Seven-Percent Solution: A Review of Philanthropic Housing, 1870--1910." *Journal of Urban History*, August 1981, 403-38.

Brace, Charles L. "Model Tenement Houses." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, February 1878, 47.

Braun, Hugh. *An Introduction to Medieval Architecture*. London: Faber and Faber, n.d. See especially pp. 248-9 on almshouses.

Bremner, Robert H. *American Philanthropy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Bremner, Robert H. "The Big Flat: History of a New York Tenement House." *American Historical Review* No. 1 (1958): 54-62.

Burdett, Henry C. "Cottage (Small) Hospital Construction and Management." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, December 20, 1883, 68-9, April 24, 1884, 497-9.

"Charleston (S.C.) Drainage Difficulties." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, November 1, 1880, 462.

Curl, James Steven. *Victorian Architecture*. London: David and Charles, 1990. See especially chapter 4, "Philanthropic Housing and the Concern for the Underdog: Model Dwellings and Model Villages," pp. 149-177.

Doyle, Don. *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860-1910*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

"Electric Lighting Company." *Charleston News and Courier*, September 1, 1883, 1.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Growing Old in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Fraser, Walter. *Charleston, Charleston*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

Hering, Rudolph. "Notes on the Pollution of Streams." *Engineering and Building Record and Sanitary Engineer*, March 19, 1888, 228-9.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. "Victorian Philanthropy: The Case of Toynbee Hall." *American Scholar*, Summer 1990, 373-84.

"Homes of the Poor." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, November 1878, 262.

"Improved Homes for Workingmen." *Plumber and Sanitary Engineer*, December 1878, 1.

Loudon, John. *Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture*. London: 1842. See especially pp. 184-5 on "double cottages."

Owen, David. *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1964. See especially chapter XIV, "Philanthropy and Five Percent: Housing Experiments," 372-393.

Papers of the Colin McK. Grant Home for Aged Presbyterians, Charleston, SC. Second Presbyterian Church, 342 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. "Early Working Class Housing." *Studies in Art, Architecture, and Design*. New York: Walker and Co., 1968. 2: 18-37.

Preservation Consultants, Inc. "94 Queen Street, Information Package." Department of Planning and Urban Development, 116 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC. Discusses the early history of electric lighting technology in Charleston.

Ravenel, Beatrice St. Julien. *Architects of Charleston*. Charleston: Carolina Art Association, 1946.

Rosen, Robert. *A Short History of Charleston*. San Francisco: Lexikos, 1982.

Roth, Leland. *A Concise History of American Architecture*. New York: Icon Editions, 1979.

Roth, Leland. *America Builds: Source Documents in American Architecture and Planning*. New York: Icon Editions, 1983.

Rothman, David J. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1971, 1990. See especially chapter 8, "The Almshouse Experience," 180-205.

Stockton, Robert P. "King St. Hardware Store Cited as 'Model of Beauty' in 1892." *Charleston News and Courier*, December 28, 1981, 1-B. On W. B. W. Howe, Jr.'s Poppenheim Building.

Thomas, W. H. J. "Philanthropist Owned Building." *Charleston News and Courier*, April 21, 1969, 1-B. On Enston's Phoenix Furniture Co. building.

Victoria History of the Counties of England -- Kent, vol. 2 of 3. London: St. Catherine Press, 1926.

Warner, Amos G. *American Charities*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1894, 1908.

Weiner, Deborah E. B. "The Architecture of Victorian Philanthropy: The Settlement House as Manorial Residence." *Art History*, June 1990, 213-27.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981.

Zaitzevksy, Cynthia. "Housing Boston's Poor: The First Philanthropic Experiments." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, May 1983, 157-67.

PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

Documentation of the William Enston Home was undertaken during the summer of 1993 by the Washington Office of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) of the National Park Service. The principals involved were Robert J. Kapsch, HABS/HAER Division Chief, and Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief of HABS. The project was sponsored by the Historic Charleston Foundation, Lawrence Walker, Executive Director, and Jonathan H. Poston, Director of Preservation Programs. Additional support was provided by the Charleston Housing Authority, Don Cameron, Director, and the Enston Home Board of Trustees, Park Smith, Chairman. The measured drawings were executed under the direction of Frederick J. Lindstrom, HABS Staff Architect. The field recording was conducted by Project Supervisor Douglas S. Anderson and Architecture Technicians John M. Biggs and M. Douglas Godfrey. Under the direction of Alison K. Hoagland, HABS Senior Historian, the historical report and written building surveys were produced by Keith L. Eggener, the 1993 Sally Kress Tompkins Fellow of the Society of Architectural Historians and HABS. Recognition should also go to Paul Helton, Superintendent of the William Enston Home, for his cooperation and assistance.

ADDENDUM TO:
WILLIAM ENSTON HOME
900 King Street
Charleston
Charleston County
South Carolina

HABS SC-686
SC,10-CHAR,354-

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001